

REMARKS / ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action dated June 3, 2009, the Examiner rejected claims 1 - 4. Applicants are amending claims 1 and 2 and cancelling claim 4. No new matter is being added.

1. Claim Rejections

The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,856,975 to Rostoker et al. Applicants traverse. Applicants submit that claim 1, as amended, is patentable over Rostoker et al. by at least reciting:

Electronic device integrated into a reception system for digital television networks, comprising:

two or more network accesses that generate two or more different data flows, each of the different data flows corresponding to a different Motion Picture Expert Group (MPEG) data transport stream;

common interface modules that may act as filters, transformers or regenerators of data; ~~and~~

two or more reception devices that extract and interpret each data flow;

a routing device for routing the data flows; and

a central processor and a common interface controller for

-managing MPEG (~~Motion Picture Expert Group~~) data flows so that the data from the two or more network accesses are routed by the routing device to the various sources are routed to two or more reception devices, with each of said data flows being redirected through the common interface modules if necessary and

-generating the data for two or more final applications, simultaneously.

The following amendments to claim 1 are supported by the following parts of the original application:

— two or more network accesses that generate two or more different data flows, each of the different data flows corresponding to a different MPEG data transport stream; original page 3, lines 22-23 and former claim 4.

— two or more reception devices that extract and interpret each data flow; original page 3, lines 24-25.

- a routing device for routing the data flows; original page 4, lines 1-3 and figure 2, reference 10.
- a central processor and a common interface controller for managing the MPEG (Motion Picture Expert Group) data flows so that the data from the two or more network accesses are routed by the routing device to the two or more reception devices, with each of said data flows being redirected through the common interface modules if necessary; original page 3, line 25-page 4, line 3.
- generating the data for two or more final applications, simultaneously; original page 3, last line.

The amendment to claim 2 is supported by original figure 2, reference 10.

Rostoker et al. disclose a device 300 (see figures 1 and 2) connected to a network over a **single** access (see reference 330). A single MPEG data stream coming from this access may be decoded into video and audio by a video decoder 344 and audio 345 (see figure 3), respectively. The video part of this stream may be redirected through a decryption circuit 351 if necessary before being decoded by circuit 344 (see column 10, lines 25-34).

In contrast to the claimed invention, which requires two or more data flows from different network accesses, Rostoker et al. disclose at column 10, lines 18-30, column 12, lines 31-38, column 14, lines 55-64 and column 15, lines 13-21 how **the audio is synchronized to the corresponding video**. So, it should be concluded that these passages together show that the audio and video referred to in column 7, lines 6-19 is **related**, i.e., it belongs to a single application of video and **corresponding** audio. After being received at the single network access 330 of apparatus 300, the video and audio data are converted (see references 327,328 and 325 of figure 2) into a **single** MPEG data stream comprising audio and video frames. This single stream is decoded and the resulting video and audio reproduced on screen 307 and audio output 308 (see figure 1).

On the contrary, the claimed invention recites **multiple** MPEG data streams are generated at **multiple** network accesses and are routed between the multiple network accesses, common interface modules and reception devices.

Further, Rostoker et al. disclose that the MPEG stream is provided to a **bus** (see figure 3, reference 342). The video decoder and audio decoder extract the audio and video frames out of this stream. On the contrary, the present invention uses a **router device** to provide the routing of the different data streams between network accesses, common interface modules and the reception devices.

In addition, Rostoker et al. does not disclose two or more different MPEG data streams. For this reason, it does not disclose either that the interface modules are **common** for those streams.

The claimed invention has the following **advantages** over the use of **two separate decoding devices** (see the paragraph bridging pages 2 and 3):

- decrease in cost;
- an increase in features and flexibility in using the common interface modules, since no outside intervention is needed to change from one flow to another (it is not needed to physically move an interface module from the connection bay of one device to the other, as in the case of using two separate decoding devices);

Accordingly, claim 1 is patentable over Rostoker et al. Further, claims 2 and 3 are patentable over Rostoker et al. at least by virtue of their dependency.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest and *bona fide* effort to clarify the issues before the Examiner and to place this case in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of all of claims is believed to be in order, and a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional required fees from Deposit Account No. 503557, Deposit Account Name NIXON PEABODY LLP.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the foregoing, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney at (650) 320 7754.

Respectfully submitted,

Appl. No. 11/423,145
Amdt. dated August 4, 2009
Reply to Office action of June 3, 2009

Docket No.: 460582.000006

Date: August 4, 2009

/Aaron Wininger, Reg. No. 45,229/

Aaron Wininger
Reg. No. 45,229
NIXON PEABODY LLP
200 Page Mill Road, Suite 200
Palo Alto, CA 94306